

String Representation for the 't Hooft Loop Average in the Abelian Higgs Model

D.V.ANTONOV ^{*}[†]

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics,
B.Chermushkinskaya 25, 117 218, Moscow, Russia
and*

*Institut für Physik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,
Invalidenstrasse 110, D-10115, Berlin, Germany*

Abstract

Making use of the duality transformation, we derive in the Londons' limit of the Abelian Higgs Model string representation for the 't Hooft loop average defined on the string world-sheet, which yields the values of two coefficient functions parametrizing the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors. The asymptotic behaviours of these functions agree with the ones obtained within the Method of Vacuum Correlators in QCD in the lowest order of perturbation theory. We demonstrate that the bilocal approximation to the Method of Vacuum Correlators is an exact result in the Londons' limit, i.e. all the higher cumulants in this limit vanish. We also show that at large distances, apart from the integration over metrics, the obtained string effective theory (which in this case reduces to the nonlinear massive axionic sigma model) coincides with the low-energy limit of the dual version of 4D compact QED, the so-called Universal Confining String Theory. We derive string tension of the Nambu-Goto term and the coupling constant of the rigidity term for the obtained string effective theory and demonstrate that the latter one is always negative, which means the stability of strings, while the positiveness of the former is confirmed by the present lattice data. These data enable us to find the Higgs boson charge and the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field, which model QCD best of all. We also study dynamics of the weight factor of the obtained string representation for the 't Hooft average in the loop space. In conclusion, we obtain string representation for the partition function of the correlators of an arbitrary number of Higgs currents, by virtue of which we rederive the structure of the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors, which yields the surface term in the string effective action.

^{*}E-mail addresses: antonov@pha2.physik.hu-berlin.de and antonov@vxitep.itep.ru

[†]Supported by Graduiertenkolleg *Elementarteilchenphysik*, Russian Fundamental Research Foundation, Grant No.96-02-19184, DFG-RFFI, Grant 436 RUS 113/309/0, and by the INTAS, Grant No.94-2851.

1. Introduction

Abelian Higgs Model (AHM) in the Londons' limit is known to display a lot of properties of the confining phase of gluodynamics, which makes it reasonable to consider Abrikosov-Nielsen-Olesen strings in this model as the objects which could tell us something about the behaviour of the gluodynamics string. To this end, in Ref. 1 the AHM partition function has been rewritten via string variables by making use of the duality transformation² and accounting for the Jacobian, which emerges when one passes from the collective field variables to the string ones. This Jacobian has been shown to yield the Polchinski-Strominger term³ in the string action with the coupling constant ensuring exact cancellation of the conformal anomaly in 4D.

An alternative approach to the string representation of gauge theories based on the Method of Vacuum Correlators (MVC)^{4,5} has been proposed in Ref. 6, where the QCD string effective action has been derived by performing the expansion of the Wilson loop average. Both in Refs. 1 and 6, the sign of the rigidity term has been obtained to be negative, which means the stability of strings in the models under consideration^{7,8}. However, the two main disadvantages of the method proposed in Ref. 6 w.r.t. the one of Ref. 1 were the lack of the mechanism of cancellation of the conformal anomaly and the integration over metrics in the final expression for the Wilson average. The most natural way in the solution of these problems might lie in considering the strong background fields in QCD, which ensure confinement, as a collective variable leading to the summation over surfaces.

In this Letter, we shall combine the approaches of Refs. 1 and 6 by considering the 't Hooft loop average in the AHM without monopoles and find the string representation for it. By making use of this representation, we shall demonstrate that the bilocal approximation to the MVC is an exact result in the Londons' limit, and obtain the values of two coefficient functions which parametrize the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors. Studying the asymptotic behaviours of these functions at small and large distances and comparing them with the corresponding behaviours known from the bilocal approximation to MVC in gluodynamics, we shall conclude that the Londons' limit reproduces well the long distance regime of gluodynamics, whereas the short distance one is reproduced only in the lowest order of perturbation theory. These points will be the topic of the next Section.

In Section 3, we shall present the values of the string tension of the Nambu-Goto term and the rigidity term coupling constant in the obtained string effective theory. The latter one occurs to be always negative, which, as it was mentioned above, means the stability of strings. Demanding the positiveness of the string tension, we arrive at some constraint to the Higgs boson charge, which is satisfied according to the present lattice data. Based on these data, we also find the value of the v.e.v. of the Higgs field, which corresponds to gluodynamics best of all.

In Section 4, we derive the equation of motion for the weight factor in the string representation of the 't Hooft loop average in the loop space. Both this equation and the string representation obtained in Section 2 demonstrate that, apart from the integration over metrics, the dual version of AHM in the Londons' limit coincides at large distances with the large distance regime of the dual version of the 4D compact QED, the so-called Universal Confining String Theory (UCST)^{9,10}, whose loop space dynamics was investigated in Ref. 11.

In Section 5, we obtain string representation for the partition function of the correlators of an arbitrary number of the Higgs currents, with the help of which we then get the correlator of two such currents. Due to the semiclassical connection between this correlator and the structure in the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors which yields surface term in the string

effective action⁵, we rederive the coefficient function standing at this structure.

In Conclusion, we shall focus ourselves at some physical consequences of the obtained results and discuss possible further developments of the suggested approach.

2. String Representation for the 't Hooft Loop Average and the Exact Result for the Bilocal Correlator of the Dual Field Strength Tensors in the Londons' Limit

In this Section, we shall consider string representation for the 't Hooft loop average, $\int \mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi) \langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle$, which is defined on the closed string world-sheet S (we consider AHM without monopoles, where the only surfaces are the Abrikosov-Nielsen-Olesen strings' world-sheets). In what follows, we shall be interested in the weight factor of this representation,

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \int |\Phi| \mathcal{D}|\Phi| \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\theta^{\text{reg.}} \exp \left\{ - \int dx \left[\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2} |D_\mu \Phi|^2 + \lambda (|\Phi|^2 - \eta^2)^2 + \frac{\pi}{Ne} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} T_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} \right] \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi(x) = |\Phi(x)| e^{i\theta(x)}$, $\theta = \theta^{\text{sing.}} + \theta^{\text{reg.}}$, $T_{\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x(\xi)) \delta(x - x(\xi))$ is the vorticity tensor current, which is a functional of S , and $D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - iNeA_\mu$, so that the Higgs boson carries electric charge Ne . Notice, that, as it was already mentioned in the Introduction, in what follows, we shall, similarly to Ref. 8, for simplicity disregard the Jacobian arising when one passes from the integration over $\theta^{\text{sing.}}$ to the integration over $x_\mu(\xi)$. It is also worth mentioning, that from now on we shall make use of notations of Ref. 1, so that due to the lack of imaginary unit in front of the last term on the R.H.S. of Eq. (1), the sign of the second term of the cumulant expansion of Eq. (1) will be opposite to the standard one.

In the Londons' limit, Eq. (1) takes the form

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\theta^{\text{reg.}} \exp \left\{ - \int dx \left[\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2} (\partial_\mu \theta - NeA_\mu)^2 + \frac{\pi}{Ne} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} T_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} \right] \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Notice, that the S -dependence is present in Eq. (2) both in the last term and in the term $\partial_\mu \theta^{\text{sing.}}$ due to the equation² $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho \partial_\sigma \theta^{\text{sing.}}(x) = 2\pi T_{\mu\nu}(x)$. That is why, the naive application of the Gauss theorem (where only the S -dependence in the last term in Eq. (2) is accounted for) is not valid, and therefore the S -dependence in Eq. (2) could not be reduced to the volume one.

Performing the duality transformation of the R.H.S. of Eq. (2) along the lines described in Refs. 1,2, and 8, we arrive at the following formula

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}h_{\mu\nu} \exp \left\{ \int dx \left[-\frac{1}{12\eta^2} H_{\mu\nu\lambda}^2 + i\pi h_{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{iNe}{4} h_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\pi}{Ne} T_{\alpha\beta} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $H_{\mu\nu\lambda} \equiv \partial_\mu h_{\nu\lambda} + \partial_\lambda h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu h_{\lambda\mu}$ is a strength tensor of an antisymmetric field $h_{\mu\nu}$. From now on in this Section, we shall omit the preexponential factor, since our main result, the coefficient

functions parametrizing the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors (see Eqs. (11) and (12) below) will be obtained upon comparison of the two exponents, the result of the Gaussian integrations and the one of the cumulant expansion of Eq. (2).

One's first instinct is to fix some, for concreteness Feynman, gauge by adding to the Lagrangian standing in the exponent on the R.H.S. of Eq. (3) the gauge fixing term $\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu A_\mu)^2$ and carry out the Gaussian integration over A_μ , which then can be easily performed and yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \exp \left\{ - \int dx \left[\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{iNe}{4} h_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\pi}{Ne} T_{\alpha\beta} \right) + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu A_\mu)^2 \right] \right\} = \\ = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int dx dy \frac{1}{|x-y|^4} \left[4 \frac{(x-y)_\mu (x-y)_\nu}{(x-y)^2} - \delta_{\mu\nu} \right] \cdot \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left[\left(\frac{2\pi}{Ne} \right)^2 T_{\lambda\mu}(x) T_{\lambda\nu}(y) - \left(\frac{Ne}{2} \right)^2 h_{\lambda\mu}(x) h_{\lambda\nu}(y) + 2\pi i T_{\lambda\mu}(x) h_{\lambda\nu}(y) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

However we immediately see that Eqs. (3) and (4) provide us with such a representation of $\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle$, which is difficult to proceed with.

It is much more convenient to rewrite $\exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} \int dx F_{\mu\nu}^2 \right)$ as

$$\int \mathcal{D}G_{\mu\nu} \exp \left\{ \int dx \left[-G_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{i}{2} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} G_{\alpha\beta} \right] \right\},$$

after which A_μ - and $G_{\mu\nu}$ -integrations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}B_\mu \mathcal{D}h_{\mu\nu} \exp \left\{ \int dx \left[-\frac{1}{12\eta^2} H_{\mu\nu\lambda}^2 + i\pi h_{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu} - \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \left(\frac{Ne}{2} h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{2\pi i}{Ne} T_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu \right)^2 \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

i.e. we have replaced the A_μ -integration by the B_μ one. Next, performing the hypergauge transformation with the function $\frac{2}{Ne} B_\mu$, which is equivalent to fixing the gauge by the condition $B_\mu = 0$ (see the first Ref. in⁸), we get from Eq. (5)

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}h_{\mu\nu} \exp \left\{ \int dx \left[-\frac{1}{12\eta^2} H_{\mu\nu\lambda}^2 - \left(\frac{Ne}{2} \right)^2 h_{\mu\nu}^2 + \left(\frac{2\pi}{Ne} \right)^2 T_{\mu\nu}^2 + 3\pi i h_{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu} \right] \right\}, \quad (6)$$

which apart from the term

$$\exp \left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{Ne} \right)^2 \int dx T_{\mu\nu}^2 \right) = \exp \left(\left(\frac{2\pi}{Ne} \right)^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x') \delta(x-x') \right) \quad (7)$$

is the partition function of the massive Kalb-Ramond field interacting with the string (nonlinear massive axionic sigma model¹²). Notice, that this is also a low-energy expression for the partition function of the 4D UCST, studied in Ref. 10, which is in fact the dual version of the 4D compact QED. Therefore one may conclude that at sufficiently large distances, when the term (7) (or, better to say, its regularized version, which will be presented immediately below) can be neglected, the Londons' limit of AHM coincides with the low-energy limit of the 4D compact QED.

It is also worth mentioning, that the reduction of AHM in the Londons' limit to the nonlinear axionic sigma model enables one to apply methods developed for such models, for example, for the phenomenological description of fluctuations of the string world-sheet¹³.

Regularizing the term (7) and performing the Gaussian integration over $h_{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (6) we arrive at the following representation for the weight factor (2)

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_N(S) \rangle = \exp \left[\left(\frac{m\eta}{2} \right)^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x') e^{-\frac{m^2}{4}(x-x')^2} - 9\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-x') \right]. \quad (8)$$

Here $m \equiv Ne\eta$ is the mass of the Kalb-Ramond field (equal to the mass of the gauge boson generated by the Higgs mechanism), which under the assumption that it is sufficiently large has been chosen as an UV cutoff for the term (7). The reason for such a choice of the UV cutoff is based on the large distance behaviour of the bilocal correlator, described by Eqs. (15) and (16) below, according to which the mass m could be identified with the inverse correlation length of the vacuum in QCD, T_g^{-1} (see also discussion in Ref. 13). The latter quantity is large in the confining regime w.r.t. r^{-1} , where r is a typical length scale in the problem under study, i.e. a size of the Wilson loop in QCD, or a radius of the closed surface S in our approach. This fact served as a motivation for the curvature expansion of the string effective action in Ref. 6, which is actually an expansion in powers of $\left(\frac{T_g}{r}\right)^2$.

The propagator of the Kalb-Ramond field in Eq. (8) has the following form (the details of derivation of this propagator are presented in the Appendix to Ref. 13)

$$D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x) \equiv D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(1)}(x) + D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(2)}(x),$$

where

$$D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(1)}(x) = \frac{Ne\eta^3}{8\pi^2} \frac{K_1}{|x|} \left(\delta_{\lambda\mu} \delta_{\nu\rho} - \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta_{\lambda\rho} \right), \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(2)}(x) = & \frac{\eta}{4\pi^2 Ne x^2} \left[\left[\frac{K_1}{|x|} + \frac{m}{2} (K_0 + K_2) \right] \left(\delta_{\lambda\mu} \delta_{\nu\rho} - \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta_{\lambda\rho} \right) + \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{2|x|} \left[3 \left(\frac{m^2}{4} + \frac{1}{x^2} \right) K_1 + \frac{3m}{2|x|} (K_0 + K_2) + \frac{m^2}{4} K_3 \right] \cdot \\ & \cdot \left(\delta_{\lambda\rho} x_\mu x_\nu + \delta_{\mu\nu} x_\lambda x_\rho - \delta_{\mu\lambda} x_\nu x_\rho - \delta_{\nu\rho} x_\mu x_\lambda \right) \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$K_i \equiv K_i(m|x|)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, stand for the Macdonald functions, and one can show that the term

$$\int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(2)}(x-x')$$

could be rewritten as a boundary one, and therefore vanishes, since S is closed. In particular, as it could be anticipated from the beginning, when $m \rightarrow 0$, the contribution of the function (9) vanishes, whereas

$$\int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(2)}(x-x') \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2(\pi N e)^2} \oint_{\partial S} dx_\mu \oint_{\partial S} dx'_\mu \frac{1}{(x-x')^2}.$$

Comparing Eqs. (8)-(10) with the result of the cumulant expansion of the weight factor (2), we obtain the following values of the coefficient functions, which parametrize the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors

$$D(m^2 x^2) = \frac{m^3}{16\pi^2} \left[9 \frac{K_1}{|x|} - m e^{-\frac{m^2 x^2}{4}} \right] \quad (11)$$

and

$$D_1(m^2 x^2) = \frac{9m}{8\pi^2 x^2} \left[\frac{K_1}{|x|} + \frac{m}{2} (K_0 + K_2) \right], \quad (12)$$

whose asymptotic behaviours at $|x| \ll \frac{1}{m}$ and $|x| \gg \frac{1}{m}$ read

$$D \longrightarrow \frac{9}{16\pi^2} \frac{m^2}{x^2}, \quad (13)$$

$$D_1 \longrightarrow \frac{9}{4\pi^2 |x|^4} \quad (14)$$

and

$$D \longrightarrow \frac{9m^4}{16\sqrt{2}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{e^{-m|x|}}{(m|x|)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad (15)$$

$$D_1 \longrightarrow \frac{9m^4}{8\sqrt{2}\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{e^{-m|x|}}{(m|x|)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \quad (16)$$

respectively.

We see that according to Eq. (8) all the terms of the cumulant expansion, higher than the quadratic one, vanish, so that the bilocal approximation to MVC is an exact result in the London's limit, or in another language, the ensemble of fields in this case is exactly Gaussian.

The asymptotic behaviours (13)-(16) have already been discussed and compared with the lattice data¹⁴ in Ref. 13. Namely, we see that Eqs. (15) and (16) reproduce correctly the long-range dynamics, i.e. the exponential fall-offs, and the result, that D_1 at large distances is smaller than D . However, as far as the short-distance dynamics is concerned, one can see that though Eq. (14) yields the correct $\frac{1}{|x|^4}$ -behaviour of the function D_1 , Eq. (13) agrees with the results obtained within the MVC in QCD in Ref. 15 only in the lowest order of perturbation theory, where the function D is much smaller than the function D_1 . This result is a consequence of the Abelian character of the model under study.

3. Realistic Values of Charge and V.E.V. of the Higgs Field and Consistency of the London's Limit

The derivative (or curvature, or $\frac{1}{m}$ -) expansion of the action

$$\left(\frac{m\eta}{2}\right)^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x') e^{-\frac{m^2}{4}(x-x')^2} - 9\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}^{(1)}(x-x')$$

yields the following values of the string tension of the Nambu-Goto term and the inverse bare coupling constant of the rigidity term

$$\sigma = \pi\eta^2 (9K_0(Ne) - 2) \simeq \pi\eta^2 \left(9 \ln \frac{2}{\gamma Ne} - 2\right) \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_0} = -\frac{5\pi}{8(Ne)^2} \quad (18)$$

respectively, where $\gamma \simeq 1.781$ stands for the Euler constant. These quantities are similar to the ones obtained for the low-energy expansion of the string effective action of the UCST in Ref. 10.

We see that though the coupling constant (18) is always negative as it should be, the string tension (17) is positive only when the following inequality holds

$$Ne < \frac{2}{\gamma e^{\frac{2}{9}}} \simeq 0.899, \quad (19)$$

i.e. only for sufficiently small values of the Higgs field charge. At this point it looks natural to address the important question on how exact is the Londons' limit of AHM in modelling the real confining regime of QCD? In order to answer this question, one should identify the mass m with T_g^{-1} , and substitute the value of the latter in the $SU(3)$ -gluodynamics¹⁴, $T_g^{-1} \simeq 1\text{GeV}$, and the value of the string tension $\sigma \simeq 0.2\text{GeV}^2$ (see, for example, Ref. 5) into Eq. (17). This yields the following equation

$$Ne = 1.12e^{-0.22-0.01(Ne)^2},$$

whose solution according to MAPLE reads

$$Ne \simeq 0.892, \quad (20)$$

which luckily satisfies inequality (19). This means the consistency of the Londons' limit of AHM in modelling QCD in the confining regime. The corresponding square root of the Higgs v.e.v. reads

$$\eta \simeq 1.121\text{GeV}. \quad (21)$$

Eqs. (20) and (21) provide us with the parameters of AHM in the Londons' limit, which according to the lattice data are the most adequate ones for the description of the confining phase of QCD.

4. Equation of Motion of the Weight Factor of the String Representation in the Loop Space

In this short Section, we shall derive a loop equation for the weight factor (6) without the multiplier (7), which could be referred to the measure $\mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi)$. We shall denote the weight factor (6) without this multiplier as $\langle \bar{\mathcal{F}}_N[x(\xi)] \rangle$.

Variation w.r.t. $h_{\nu\lambda}(x)$ under the functional integral yields

$$\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{2\eta^2} \left(\square h_{\nu\lambda} + \partial_\mu \partial_\nu h_{\lambda\mu} + \partial_\mu \partial_\lambda h_{\mu\nu} \right) - \frac{(Ne)^2}{2} h_{\nu\lambda} \right) \Phi[h[x(\xi)]] + 3i\pi T_{\nu\lambda} \Phi[h[x(\xi)]] \right\rangle_{h_{\mu\nu}} = 0, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\Phi[h[x(\xi)]] \equiv \exp \left(3i\pi \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\nu}(x(\xi)) h_{\mu\nu}[x(\xi)] \right),$$

and

$$\langle \dots \rangle_{h_{\mu\nu}} \equiv \int \mathcal{D}h_{\mu\nu} \exp \left(- \int dx \left(\frac{1}{12\eta^2} H_{\mu\nu\lambda}^2 + \left(\frac{Ne}{2} \right)^2 h_{\mu\nu}^2 \right) \right) (\dots).$$

Eq. (22) when being reformulated in the loop space reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2} \left(\partial^{x(\sigma)^2} \frac{\delta}{\delta \sigma_{\nu\lambda}(x(\sigma))} + \partial_\mu^x \partial_\nu^x \frac{\delta}{\delta \sigma_{\lambda\mu}(x)} + \partial_\mu^x \partial_\lambda^x \frac{\delta}{\delta \sigma_{\mu\nu}(x)} \right) - \right. \\ & \left. - (Ne)^2 \frac{\delta}{\delta \sigma_{\nu\lambda}(x)} - 18\pi^2 T_{\nu\lambda}[x(\sigma)] \right) \langle \bar{\mathcal{F}}_N[x(\sigma)] \rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $x_\mu(\sigma)$, $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$, is an element of the loop space, corresponding to an arbitrary closed contour C lying on S [for example, $x_\mu(\sigma) = x_\mu(\xi_1, \xi_2 = \text{const.})$],

$$\partial_\mu^{x(\sigma)} \equiv \int_{\sigma-0}^{\sigma+0} d\tau \frac{\delta}{\delta x_\mu(\tau)},$$

and

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta \sigma_{\mu\nu}(x(\sigma))} = \int_{-0}^{+0} d\tau \tau \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_\mu \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\tau \right) \delta x_\nu \left(\sigma - \frac{1}{2}\tau \right)}.$$

Eq. (23) coincides with the low-energy limit of the loop equation for the Wilson average in 4D compact QED, studied in Ref. 11, which is in the line with the discussion following after Eq. (7). The reader is referred to Ref. 11 for further investigations of Eq. (23).

5. String Representation for the Partition Function of the Higgs Currents' Correlators

Let us derive the bilocal correlator of the dual field strength tensors from the string representation for the partition function of an arbitrary number of the Higgs currents. In the Londons' limit, such a partition function reads

$$\mathcal{Z}[J_\mu] = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}[0]} \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\theta \exp \left\{ \int dx \left[-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{\eta^2}{2} (\partial_\mu \theta - NeA_\mu)^2 + J_\mu j_\mu \right] \right\},$$

where $j_\mu \equiv -Ne\eta^2(\partial_\mu \theta - NeA_\mu)$ is the Higgs current in this limit. We use here the definition of $\mathcal{Z}[J_\mu]$ normalized to unity, since in what follows we shall get the function D from the correlator

$\langle j_\beta(x_1)j_\sigma(x_2) \rangle$ itself, rather than from the comparison of two exponents, as it has been done in Section 2.

Performing the same duality transformation as the one used in Section 2, we get the following string representation for $\mathcal{Z}[J_\mu]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}[J_\mu] = & \frac{e^{\frac{m^2}{2} \int dx J^2(x)}}{\int \mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi) e^{-\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-x')}} \int \mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi) e^{-\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-x')} \\ & \cdot \exp \left\{ Ne \varepsilon_{\lambda\nu\alpha\beta} \int dx dy \left[-\frac{Ne}{4} \varepsilon_{\mu\rho\gamma\delta} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_\alpha \partial y_\gamma} D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-y) \right) J_\beta(x) J_\delta(y) + \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \pi T_{\mu\rho}(y) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-y) \right) J_\beta(x) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Upon the two-fold variation of Eq. (24) w.r.t. J_μ , we arrive at the following expression for the correlator of two Higgs currents

$$\begin{aligned} \langle j_\beta(x_1)j_\sigma(x_2) \rangle = & \frac{(Ne)^2}{\int \mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi) e^{-\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-x')}} \\ & \cdot \int \mathcal{D}x_\mu(\xi) e^{-\pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\lambda\nu}(x) \int_S d\sigma_{\mu\rho}(x') D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x-x')} \left\{ \eta^2 \delta_{\beta\sigma} \delta(x_1 - x_2) + \right. \\ & \left. + \varepsilon_{\lambda\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{\mu\rho\gamma\sigma} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{1\alpha} \partial x_{2\gamma}} D_{\lambda\nu,\mu\rho}(x_1 - x_2) + \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \pi^2 \int_S d\sigma_{\delta\zeta}(y) \int_S d\sigma_{\chi\varphi}(z) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1\alpha}} D_{\lambda\nu,\delta\zeta}(x_1 - y) \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2\gamma}} D_{\mu\rho,\chi\varphi}(x_2 - z) \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The first term in the figured brackets on the R.H.S. of Eq. (25) obviously vanishes for $x_1 \neq x_2$. It is also easy to show that the contribution of the term (10) to the R.H.S. of Eq. (25) vanishes too. As far as the part of the axionic propagator given by Eq. (9), is concerned, one can see that it has the order of magnitude of $(Ne)^2 \eta^4$. Let us now assume that $Ne\eta^2 |S| \ll 1$, where $|S|$ stands for the area of the surface S , so that the second term in square brackets on the R.H.S. of Eq. (25) is much smaller than the first term, and could be disregarded. This approximation corresponds to the case of a very small η , i.e. to a very narrow potential.

Taking all this into account and making use of the equation⁵,

$$\langle j_\beta(x_1)j_\sigma(x_2) \rangle = \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{1\mu} \partial x_{2\mu}} \delta_{\beta\sigma} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{1\beta} \partial x_{2\sigma}} \right) D(m^2(x_1 - x_2)^2),$$

which could be obtained from the classical equation of motion, we get the following (semiclassical) value of the function D

$$D(m^2 x^2) = \frac{m^3}{4\pi^2} \frac{K_1(m|x|)}{|x|}, \quad x \neq 0. \quad (26)$$

One can see that Eq. (26) differs in a factor $\frac{9}{4}$ from the leading-order short-distance dynamics of Eq. (11), given by Eq. (13) (or from Eq. (11) itself at $x \neq 0$, where the last term on the R.H.S. without regularization vanishes). Besides the neglect of the second term in square brackets on the R.H.S. of Eq. (25), the difference between $\frac{9}{4}$ and 1 describes the error of the semiclassical approximation. Notice also, that only the function D could be obtained from the correlator (25) in the semiclassical approximation due to the independence of the latter of the function D_1 in this approximation.

6. Conclusion

Let us now stress some physical consequences of the obtained results and discuss open questions. The first outcome of the Letter is the result of Section 2 that at large distances AHM in the Londons' limit coincides with the low-energy limit of the 4D compact QED. Secondly, we have demonstrated that the bilocal approximation to the MVC is exact in the Londons' limit, i.e. all the higher cumulants vanish. Thirdly, we have proved that the Londons' limit is consistent for the description of the confining phase of QCD according to the lattice data, and found the most adequate to QCD values of charge and the square root of the v.e.v. of the Higgs field, which are given by Eqs. (20) and (21) respectively. The most important result of the Letter is the two scalar functions, D and D_1 , given by Eqs. (11) and (12) respectively, which parametrize the correlator of the two dual field strength tensors and are known to be the key quantities in the MVC.

Notice, that already in Ref. 13 it has been conjectured that the functions D and D_1 must follow from the propagator of the massive Kalb-Ramond field. In Ref. 13, this conjecture has been supported by comparison of the asymptotic behaviours of these functions at small and large distances obtained from such a propagator with the ones observed in the lattice measurements¹⁴. In this Letter, we have proved this conjecture and in addition obtained integration over metrics resulting from the integration over the singular part of the Higgs wave function. However, it is unclear what collective variable in QCD may serve for getting such an integration over metrics. As it has been already mentioned in the Introduction, the most physically appropriate candidate for this variable is the strong background fields, which provide confinement in the QCD vacuum. The solution of the problem of whether this is really the case or not will be the topic of a separate publication.

It is also worth mentioning, that, as it has been discussed in Section 2, the short-distance asymptotics (13) of the function D agrees with the MVC only in the lowest order of perturbation theory. In order to get better correspondence with the MVC, one should investigate AHM in the vicinity of the Londons' limit, i.e. account for the corrections which come from the finiteness of the coupling constant λ in Eq. (1), which presumably takes place for the "physical" AHM, i.e. the one, which describes QCD with the best accuracy¹⁶. In this way, the bilocal approximation will not be exact any more, and higher cumulants will start contributing into the Nambu-Goto term string tension and the rigidity term coupling constant. The effects arising due to these cumulants will be studied in the next publications.

The final (technical) problem, which must be solved, is accounting for the Jacobian, which arises when one passes from the integration over the singular part of the Higgs wave function to the integration over metrics and has been omitted for simplicity in this Letter. This Jacobian has been calculated in Ref. 1 and, as it has been mentioned in the Introduction, yields the Polchinski-Strominger term³ with the coupling constant ensuring exact cancellation of the conformal anomaly in $D=4$.

7. Acknowledgments

The author is deeply grateful to Profs. Yu.M.Makeenko, M.I.Polikarpov and Yu.A.Simonov, and also to E.T.Akhmedov for the useful discussions and encouragement. He is also indebted to M.N.Chernodub for critical reading the manuscript and a lot of useful remarks. He would also like to thank the theory group of the Quantum Field Theory Department of the Institute of Physics of the Humboldt University of Berlin and especially Profs. D.Ebert, D.Lüst, and M.Müller-Preußker for kind hospitality.

References

1. M.I.Polikarpov, U.-J.Wiese, and M.A.Zubkov, *Phys.Lett.* **B309**, 133 (1993); E.T.Akhmedov, M.N.Chernodub, M.I.Polikarpov, and M.A.Zubkov, *Phys.Rev.* **D53**, 2087 (1996); E.T.Akhmedov, *JETP Lett.* **64**, 82 (1996).
2. K.Lee, *Phys.Rev.* **D48**, 2493 (1993).
3. J.Polchinski and A.Strominger, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **67**, 1681 (1991).
4. H.G.Dosch, *Phys.Lett.* **190**, 177 (1987); Yu.A.Simonov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B307**, 512 (1988); H.G.Dosch and Yu.A.Simonov, *Phys.Lett.* **B205**, 339 (1988), *Z.Phys.* **C45**, 147 (1989); Yu.A.Simonov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B324**, 67 (1989), *Phys.Lett.* **B226**, 151 (1989), *Phys.Lett.* **B228**, 413 (1989), *Yad.Fiz.* **58**, 113 (1995), preprint ITEP-PH-97-4 (*hep-ph/9704301*); for a review see Yu.A.Simonov, *Yad.Fiz.* **54**, 192 (1991).
5. Yu.A.Simonov *Phys.Usp.* **39**, 313 (1996).
6. D.V.Antonov, D.Ebert, and Yu.A.Simonov, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A11**, 1905 (1996).
7. H.Kleinert, *Phys.Lett.* **B211**, 151 (1988); K.I.Maeda and N.Turok, *Phys.Lett.* **B202**, 376 (1988); S.M.Barr and D.Hochberg, *Phys.Rev.* **D39**, 2308 (1989); H.Kleinert, *Phys.Lett.* **B246**, 127 (1990); H.Kleinert and A.M.Chervyakov, *hep-th/9601030* (in press in *Phys.Lett.* **B**); M.Anderson, F.Bonjour, R.Gregory, and J.Stewart, *Phys.Rev.* **D56**, 8014 (1997).
8. P.Orland, *Nucl.Phys.* **B428**, 221 (1994); M.Sato and S.Yahikozawa, *Nucl.Phys.* **B436**, 100 (1995).
9. A.M.Polyakov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B486**, 23 (1997).
10. M.C.Diamantini, F.Quevedo, and C.A.Trugenberger, *Phys.Lett.* **B396**, 115 (1997).
11. D.V.Antonov, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A12**, 1419 (1997).
12. M.B.Green, J.H.Schwarz, and E.Witten, *Superstring Theory*, Vols. I, II (Cambridge University Press, England, 1987).
13. D.V.Antonov, *hep-th/9707245*.
14. A. Di Giacomo and H.Panagopoulos, *Phys.Lett.* **B285**, 133 (1992); A. Di Giacomo, E.Meggiolaro, and H.Panagopoulos, *hep-lat/9603017* (preprints IFUP-TH 12/96 and UCY-PHY-96/5) (in press in *Nucl.Phys.* **B**).
15. M.Eidemüller and M.Jamin, *hep-ph/9709419*; Yu.A.Simonov and V.I.Shevchenko, in preparation.
16. S.Kato, M.N.Chernodub, S.Kitahara, N.Nakamura, M.I.Polikarpov, and T.Suzuki, preprint KANAZAWA-97-15 (*hep-lat/9709092*); M.N.Chernodub and M.I.Polikarpov, preprint ITEP-TH-55-97 (*hep-th/9710205*).